

REMARKS

In the Office Action of September 12, 2003, claims 6-11 were rejected over Jonsson, US Pat. No. 6,272, a newly applied reference and the action was made final.

It is believed that the claims were not being properly compared with Jonsson, but before commenting on the reference, the claims have been presented in a form for the clearest comparison of the invention with the prior art.

THE INVENTION

As expressed in new claim 12, the features of the invention can be enumerated as four main features as follows:

1) a process for establishing communication between a first device (1) and a second device (2) on a computer network (3) of the Internet type, wherein the first device (1) and the second device (2) are also operable on a telephone network (4), the process comprising:

2) the first device (1) calling the second device (2) on the telephone network (4) to invite the second device (2) into the said communication by giving it the references (IP31, XX, YY) of a message accessible on the computer network (3),

3) the first device (1) connecting to the computer network (3), to receive a computer address (IP1) and to incorporate it into the aforesaid message, and

4) the second device (2) connecting itself to the computer network (3), to access the aforesaid message, to obtain the computer address (IP1) of the calling device (1) and to establish communication with the calling device (1).

JONSSON, US PAT. NO. 6,272,212

The Office Action cited column 3, lines 8-12 and 17-21, col. 4, lines 11-22 and col. 5, lines 10-124 as containing the a disclosure that rendered the claims anticipated.

First, it is first to be appreciated that Jonsson always speaks of computer networks and telephone networks in "EITHER-OR" terms and not in "AND" terms. The present invention claims involvement of both networks in the process, but Jonsson

discloses using only one network or the other in alternative embodiments.

Feature 1 of claim 12 recites:

"1) a process for establishing communication between a first device (1) and a second device (2) on a computer network (3) of the Internet type, wherein the first device (1) and the second device (2) are also operable on a telephone network."

Jonsson always discloses communication between a conference service node and individual user-type devices, whereas the present claims speak in terms of one user type device communicating with another device to invite fuller communication. (Jonsson, col. 3, lines 22-28: Conference service node invites participants to communicate. The same is true of col. 4, lines 11-22 cited in the Office Action.)

Feature 2 of claim 12 recites the first device (1) calling the second device (2) on the telephone network (4) to invite the second device (2) into the said communication by giving it the references (IP31, XX, YY) of a message accessible on the computer network (3), (same device operable on both networks).

In Jonsson, the administrator calls a participant in an invitation message, but the participant on a telephone network to invite it to communication on a computer network, but calls him on the network on which the communication is going to occur; and the invitation message does not contain the references of a message accessible on the computer network, but a telephone number to call or an URL on which to click in order to make a request to participate in the conference (column 3, lines 29-33).

In the Jonsson patent in col. 5, lines 6-52, an administrator initiates a telemeeting during a dialog with a conference service node (101), coupled to a telecommunication network.

The administrator indicates to the conference service node (101) specific date and time for the telemeeting to take place, in response to what the conference service node (101)

allocates one or more temporary telephone numbers (or URL) to the telemeeting administrator.

The administrator sends to intended session participants invitation messages, containing the temporary telephone number(s).

In the Jonsson patent in col. 5, lines 6-52, an invited participant can call the temporary telephone number (or click on the URL) in order to make a request to join the conference (this is not the same as accessing a message as claimed), in response to what the conference service node (101) sends him a personal reference telephone number (or URL), associated with a particular conference bridge (110,120), which can be for example a communications switch or node in a PSTN (or a host computer providing a data network voice service).

The invited participant calls the personal telephone number, the administrator is alerted and may accept its participation to the session, and in this case, the conference service node (101) then directs the switch to connect the calling participant into the conference.

The Office action reads the clicking of a URL on Applicant's obtaining the references of a message, but making a request in Jonsson is not the same action as the first device (1) connecting to the computer network (3), to receive a computer address (IP1) and to incorporate it into a message as recited in feature 3 of claim 12.

In Jonsson, the administrator does not connect to the computer network in order to receive a computer address and incorporate it into a computer network message.

This is because, firstly, it does not necessarily connect to the computer network, that is only one alternative and if a telephone network is used, then no computer network is necessary in Jonsson.

Secondly, even if the communication takes place in the computer network, the administrator does not give his current IP address to the intended participant, since the participant does not call directly the number of the administrator, but the personal number he has received from the conference

service node, which corresponds to a conference bridge through which the participant accesses the conference (column 4, line 52-column 5, line 6).

Feature 4 recites that the other user type device, the second device (2) connects itself to the computer network (3), to access the aforesaid message, obtains the computer address (IP1) of the calling device (1) and to establish to aforesaid communication.

In Jonsson, the participant does not necessarily connect to the computer network, and if he does, he does not access a message but makes a request for participation, and receives in response a personal number related to a conference bridge, and not the IP address of the administrator, as has been said before.

Furthermore, the "communication" in the invention is a direct communication between two devices, while "communication" in Jonsson is communicating with a conference service node. Even if only two devices (the administrator and one participant) are in communication in the conference, their communication is not direct. Each device does not know the address of the other, but calls temporary numbers (or clicks on temporary URLs) in order to connect to the conference, controlled by a conference service node, device which does not exist in the invention.


New claims 13-21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12 and add further features of the present invention. As a consequence, their features are not anticipated by US 6,272,214 neither, even taken in combination with US 6,164,547.

CONCLUSION

In view of the Amendment and Remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. After the amendment, claims 12-21 are pending and a Notice of Allowance for these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael J. McGovern
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 277-5725
Attorney of Record